

## VU Research Portal

### Explaining differences in philanthropic behavior between Christians, Muslims, and Hindus in the Netherlands

Carabain, C.L.; Bekkers, R.H.F.P.

***published in***

Review of Religious Research  
2012

***DOI (link to publisher)***

[10.1007/s13644-011-0018-1](https://doi.org/10.1007/s13644-011-0018-1)

***document version***

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication in VU Research Portal](#)

***citation for published version (APA)***

Carabain, C. L., & Bekkers, R. H. F. P. (2012). Explaining differences in philanthropic behavior between Christians, Muslims, and Hindus in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 53(4), 419-440.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s13644-011-0018-1>

**General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

**E-mail address:**

[vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl](mailto:vuresearchportal.ub@vu.nl)

# **Explaining Differences in Philanthropic Behavior Between Christians, Muslims, and Hindus in the Netherlands<sup>\*</sup>**

Christine L. Carabain (corresponding author)

Center for Philanthropic Studies

VU University Amsterdam

René Bekkers

Center for Philanthropic Studies

VU University Amsterdam

---

<sup>\*</sup> Christine L. Carabain (corresponding author), Center for Philanthropic Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences, VU University Amsterdam, De Boelelaan 1081, 1081 HV Amsterdam, The Netherlands, c.l.carabain@vu.nl. Previous versions of this paper are presented at the third World Congress of Muslim Philanthropists 2010 in Doha (Qatar) and the 8<sup>th</sup> ISTR's International Conference 2010 in Istanbul (Turkey)

# **Explaining Differences in Philanthropic Behavior Between Christians, Muslims, and Hindus in the Netherlands**

## ***Abstract***

Using survey data from the Netherlands, we find that Muslims have relatively high levels of religious philanthropic behaviour and relatively low levels of secular philanthropic behaviour, whereas Hindus have relatively low levels of religious philanthropic behaviour and higher levels of secular philanthropic behaviour. Results indicate that the community explanation *and* the conviction explanation of the relationship between religion and philanthropic behaviour are both valid to some extent when it comes to differences in philanthropic behaviour between Christians, Muslims and Hindus. Additionally, we find a relationship between group orientation in worship rituals on the relation between religion and philanthropic behaviour. The more group-oriented the worship rituals, the stronger the relation between religion and philanthropic behaviour. The results suggest that Durkheim's theory (1897) may only be valid in a Christian context.

## INTRODUCTION

Since the 1960's the religious landscape in the Netherlands has changed dramatically. The changing scenery is a result not only of secularization in Dutch society (Schmeets & te Riele 2009), but also of the arrival of immigrants in the Netherlands. A majority of the immigrants arriving in the Netherlands adhere to non-Christian faith traditions such as Islam and Hinduism.

Members of different religious groups differ in their level of volunteering and giving. For example, Protestants have higher levels of charitable giving than Roman Catholics in the Netherlands (Bekkers 2006). Similar results have been found in the U.S. (see e.g. Chaves 2002) and Canada (Berger 2006; Bowen 1999). However, as far as we know, non-Christian faith traditions are hardly ever included in studies on the relationship between religion and philanthropic behaviour. Berger (2006) did include eastern religions in her study and she found that members of Christian religious groups volunteer more hours and give higher amounts than people of eastern religious groups (Islam, Sikh, Hinduism, and Buddhism). However, she did not distinguish between the eastern religions.

In this study, we distinguish between non-Christian religions. We focus on the two most popular non-Christian religions in the Netherlands: Islam and Hinduism. We address two research questions: 1) Does the philanthropic behaviour of Muslims and Hindus differ from that of people adhering to Christian religions and the non-religious?; 2) Can differences between faith traditions be explained as a result of differences in the frequency of religious attendance and solicitation?

### ***Religion in the Netherlands today***

The current religious landscape in the Netherlands has several specific features. A first feature is the popularity of non-Christian religions in the Netherlands. The most popular non-Christian religions in the Netherlands are Islam and Hinduism. About 1 million inhabitants of the Netherlands consider themselves Muslims (Arts 2009). The majority of these Muslims (95%) are (former) guest worker immigrants from Morocco and Turkey (Van Herten 2009). The number of Hindus living in the Netherlands is considerably smaller: approximately 60.000. These Hindus are mainly (former) post colonial citizen immigrants of Surinamese descent (van der Bie 2009). Earlier studies have shown that post colonial citizen immigrants are culturally more similar to the native Dutch than guest worker immigrants (Vermeulen & Penninx 2000).

Members of non-Christian and Christian religious groups are living in geographically different areas in the Netherlands. Almost all members of these non-Christian religious groups live in the metropolitan areas, whereas Christians are more likely to live in the rural areas (van der Bie 2009). Next, we present some differences between Muslims and Christians in the Netherlands. Unfortunately, we do not have similar information available about Hindus. The main reason for this lack of knowledge is that Hindus are often in studies included in the category: 'other' religions. Muslims have higher levels of religious attendance than all other religious people in the Netherlands (Arts 2009). Also, Muslims are somewhat more likely to be male (52%), than all other religious people (48%) and Muslims are on average younger (25 years) than other religious people in the Netherlands (40 years) (Arts 2009). Secondly, another important feature of religion in the Netherlands is that relatively few people affiliate themselves with a religion. The religious represent only 58% of the Dutch population (Arts 2009). If we take a closer look at the religious population, we find that about half of them are Roman Catholic (52%), a third of them are Protestants, about 10% of the

religious are Muslims and 9% has an ‘other’ religion (Arts 2009). Hindus are among those people with an ‘other’ religion. This category also includes Jews and members of small Christian religious groups. The Netherlands does not only have a low percentage of religious people, but also those who affiliate themselves with a religion are not very likely to attend religious services regularly (Becker & De Hart 2006). Only 11 percent of the Dutch religious attends a religious service regularly – defined as at least once a week - and 72 percent of the Dutch religious (almost) never attends a religious service (Arts 2009).

### ***Philanthropic behavior***

As in other studies on charitable giving (see e.g. Osili & Du 2005) and volunteering (see e.g. Musick & Wilson 2008), we distinguish between religious and secular philanthropic behavior. Religious philanthropic behavior is directed at the church, mosque or temple. Secular philanthropic behavior is targeted to organizations other than religious institutions.

### ***Religion and Philanthropic behavior***

Scholars distinguish two reasons why religion promotes philanthropic behavior. Wuthnow (1991) refers to these explanations as ‘conviction’ and ‘community’.

The conviction explanation concerns religious teachings motivating philanthropic behavior. In a previous study among a native Dutch sample, higher levels of prosocial values were found to correlate with religious attendance and faith tradition. These higher levels of prosocial values are partly explained higher levels of charitable giving and volunteering by the religious compared with the non-religious in the Netherlands (Bekkers & Schuyt 2008).

Extending previous research, the current study will also include Islam and Hinduism. As within Christianity, Islam and Hinduism also commend philanthropy. Philanthropy has a long history and central role in Islam. The two most important types of

individual Islamic charitable giving are: zakat (the prescribed purifying alms) and sadaqa (voluntary charitable gifts). Zakat is one of the five pillars of Islam. In Hinduism, giving is referred to as *Dana*. Dana includes almost all non reciprocal giving. In Hindu teachings, it is emphasized that *Dana* cannot be motivated by immediate self-interest. *Dana* is an important part of the *Dharma* (religious duty) of Hindus. Four types of *Dana* are distinguished: dakshina, bhiksha, bheeka, and annadana. Dakshina is a pecuniary gift to the temple. *Bhiksha* also concerns giving to the temple: giving goods and food to the monks (sanyasis). *Bheeka* is giving to the poor and the needy. Finally, *annadana* is the most common form of *Dana* and concerns sharing food with others.

Differences in culture between Christian and non-Christian religions become apparent in a different norm on who is to be helped: co-religionists, people with another religion, or non-believers. In Christian teachings, the parable of the Good Samaritan is a parable told by Jesus and is referred to in the Gospel of Luke (Luke 10: 25-37). This parable is often used to demonstrate the value of helpfulness towards strangers. According to this parable, a Jewish traveler is trampled, robbed and left along the road. Both a priest and a Levite pass this man and they both ignore him. Finally, a Samaritan passes by. The Samaritan helped the Jew so clearly in need of help. In those days, Samaritans were looked upon as pagans and held in low esteem by Jews. However this did not stop the Samaritan from helping the injured man. This parable emphasizes the value of helping others regardless of their ethnic or religious background. Islamic teachings consider charitable acts not only as acts of faith, but also acts of the religious community. Islamic teachings emphasize that humans are linked to each other through their obligations to Allah. Community is built through faith, and faith is built through community. Islamic teachings describe ‘takafull’ as the responsibility of each Muslim for every other Muslim (see e.g. Alterman & Hunter 2004). We argue that philanthropy in Islamic teachings focuses more on the own religious group,

fellow Muslims, than in Christian teachings. In case of zakat, recipients even have to be Muslims. However, receivers having to be Muslim is not obligatory in case of sadaqa (Senturk 2007). Every Hindu has a *Dharma* in which giving is first aimed toward direct family and is then extended to society, the world and all living creatures (Anand 2003). Based on this *Dharma*, we state that giving in Hinduism also focuses more on the own (religious or ethnic) group than giving in Christianity. We argue that based on religious teachings the philanthropic behavior of members of Christian religious groups is more likely to include secular giving and volunteering, than the philanthropic behavior of Muslims and Hindus. Our first hypothesis reads:

*H1: Hindus and Muslims have a lower likelihood and lower levels of secular philanthropic behavior than Christians.*

The community explanation of the relationship between religion and civic engagement originates from Durkheim's (1897) theory of suicide. Assuming that different groups have the same norm namely prohibiting suicide, this theory explains differences in suicide rates by differences in the level of cohesion between religious communities. Higher levels of social cohesion in religious communities are related with lower levels of suicide. Members of religious communities with higher levels of social cohesion feel more attached to fellow members of their community (Durkheim 1897). Van Tubergen and colleagues (2005) showed that Durkheim's theory is still able to predict differences in suicide rates between faith traditions rather well. Durkheim's theory is shown to be useful in explaining differences between faith traditions in philanthropic behavior (Bekkers & Schuyt 2008). Higher contributions to church by Christian protestants are related with higher levels of religious attendance. People with higher levels of involvement in the religious community are more



likely to conform to its norms. Philanthropic behavior is an important norm in religious communities.

Though Durkheim also studied non-western religions, his theory of suicide is rooted in the European context and applies to group rituals of religious worship among Christians. Islam and Hinduism have different worship rituals. The main difference between these worship ritual is the level of individualism. For Christians, it is common for both men and women to worship God in a group ritual in a place of worship (church). In Islam, it is common for men to worship God in a group rite, but women worship God in a private ritual. Finally, in Hinduism, it is common to worship God in a private rite for both men and women and is commonly done at personal shrines at home (Anand 2003). Based on differences in worship rituals, we expect that religious attendance is more strongly related with philanthropic behavior among Christians than among than Muslims and Hindus. Our second hypothesis reads:

*H2: The relation between religious attendance and philanthropic behavior is stronger for Christians than for Muslims and Hindus.*

Engaging in philanthropy is more often than not preceded by a request to do so (Brady, Verba & Scholzman 1999; Bekkers & Schuyt 2008). Christian religious communities are known to organize activities for their members that create opportunities for their members to volunteer. Also, members of these religious communities are often asked to donate during religious services. In other words, Christian religious communities create opportunities for its members to give and volunteer (see e.g. Cnaan, Katerinaiks & Wineburg 1993). Bekkers and Schuyt found that members of Christian religious groups are more likely to have been asked

to volunteer or give than the non-religious in the Netherlands. In this paper, we test to what extent this regularity also holds true for Muslims and Hindus. Our third hypothesis reads:

*H3: Being asked to give is positively related with the likelihood and level of giving and volunteering and the amount donated among all religions.*

## **DATA AND MEASURES**

We used data from the immigrant study of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey 2008 (GINIS 2006-2008). In the spring and summer of 2008, face-to-face interviews were conducted with native Dutch and immigrants of Antillean, Moroccan, Turkish, Surinamese and Afghan descent.. Nine hundred and six respondents participated in this study, consisting of approximately 150 respondents of each group, except for respondents of Afghan descent. This group consisted of 109 respondents. Conducting survey research among immigrants has specific features, and is generally more difficult than among non-immigrants (CBS 2005). One of the major problems is that immigrants are less likely to participate in a survey study and also are harder to reach for researchers or field work agencies than non-immigrants. The latter problem is the most important reason why it still is common practice in the Netherlands to use a convenience sample for studying behavior and attitudes among immigrants. Nevertheless, using a convenience sample is far from ideal. To minimize distortion in our data caused by the use of a convenience sample, we use the same procedure and field work agency as Statistics Netherlands to collect our data. Quota were set on gender, region, age and level of education. Participants were invited to participate in a study in giving behavior. If people who engage in philanthropic behaviour are more likely to be interested to

participate in the study, we overestimated levels and likelihood of philanthropic behaviour. However, the common opinion is that the estimated relationships are not necessarily biased as a result of a selection bias (Winship & Radbill 1994).

### ***Dependent variables***

*Incidence of religious giving* was measured by asking respondents whether they gave to religious institutions, such as a church, mosque or temple. We created a dummy variable (1 = yes). Respondents who reported donations to religious institutions were asked for the *amount donated to religious institutions* in the previous year. Because of non-linearity of the raw data, these amounts donated were log-transformed. *Incidence of secular giving* was measured by asking respondents whether they gave to charitable organizations in other sectors, based on the Method-Area module (Rooney, Steinberg & Schervish 2001). Collapsing all reported contributions to organizations other than religious organizations, we created a dummy variable (1 = yes). Respondents who reported donations to secular organizations were asked for the *amount donated to secular organizations* in the previous year. Again, these amounts were log-transformed. *Incidence of religious volunteering* was measured by asking respondents if they volunteered for religious institutions, such as church, mosque or temple. We created a dummy variable (1 = yes). *Incidence of secular volunteering* was measured by asking respondents if they volunteered to organizations in other than religious sectors, based on the Method-Area module (Rooney et al. 2001). Collapsing all volunteering to other organizations other than religious institutions, we created a dummy variable (1 = yes).

### ***Independent variables***

*Religious affiliation.* We used a two-step question to measure the religious affiliation. First, we asked respondents: “Do you adhere to a religion?” Second, we asked respondents who

confirmed adhering to a religion: “What is your religion?” We recoded the answers of respondents who did not answer the follow-up question on the first question as ‘No religion/not willing to answer’. We created dummy variables for Roman-catholic, Protestant, Muslim, Hindu, Other religion, and No religion/not willing to answer. We offered ‘not willing to answer’ as a separate category to reduce socially desirable responses (Presser & Stinson 1998). Respondents in this category were recoded to the ‘no religion’ category.

*Religious attendance.* Respondents who reported adhering to a religion were asked how often they attended religious services. Respondents were asked whether they: 0 ‘never’ 1 ‘once or a few times a year’, 3 ‘once a month’ . 4 ‘once a week’ or 5 ‘more than once a week’. The non-religious were included in the category ‘never’. Although we are aware this is technically an ordinal variable, based on the relatively large number of categories we choose to include this variable in our analyses as a continuous variable. Using a set of dummy variables instead of the continuous variable does not change the results in a meaningful way. *Solicitation.* We distinguish between being asked to give inside a religious institution and being asked outside a religious institution during the last two weeks. We created a dummy variable for being asked to give inside a religious institution (1 = yes) and being asked outside a religious institution: being asked in town, at home, at work, via television, via personal letter, via internet/e-mail, via an advertisement, at a manifestation, and being asked to sponsor someone, to buy lottery tickets, and to buy something (1 = yes). We measured *asked to volunteer* by asking respondents whether they ever have been asked to volunteer and created a dummy variable (1 = yes).

*Control Variables.* In our analyses we include controls for gender (a dummy variable with female coded as 1) and age in years and several resource variables: source of personal income, level of personal income, level of education, home ownership, and knowledge of Dutch. We asked respondents’ about their main *source of personal income*. We created

dummy variables for paid workers, homemakers, persons on welfare/unemployment benefit, old age pensioners, students, and those with other sources of income (unspecified). We subsequently asked them their monthly *nett personal income*. Respondents who reported “do not know” or “do not want to say” were asked to choose a category that best represented their monthly income. Based on the monthly nett income we calculated their yearly nett income and these amounts were log-transformed. For the measurement of *level of education*, we used answers to the question on the highest level of completed education. We created dummy variables for three levels of education: lower education (no education, primary school, lower secondary vocational education, and lower general secondary education), intermediate education (upper secondary vocational education, upper general secondary education, and pre-university education) and higher education (higher professional education, and university education). *Home ownership* was measured by the question: “Do you live in a private or a rented property?” We created a dummy variable for home ownership (1 = yes). We measured *knowledge of Dutch language* by asking respondents for the meaning of four Dutch words. This measurement is based on earlier work of Alwin (1991) and Gesthuizen and Kraaykamp (2002). We presented respondents four different meanings for each word and asked them to pick the correct meaning. We created a scale for these four items. We assigned each correct answer ‘0.25’ and each wrong answer ‘0’. The new scale ranges from ‘0’ (no correct answers) to ‘1’ (four correct answers).

### ***Analytical Strategy***

To analyze the likelihood of giving and volunteering, we use logistic regression analyses. To analyze the amount donated, we use OLS regression analyses of the natural log transformations of the reported donations (excluding those who did not report donations). Like others (e.g., Osili & Du 2005), apply natural log transformations of amounts donated to

obtain approximately normal distributions in donations. We include resources in our analyses to control for ethnicity, because are not able to control for ethnicity in our analyses, because of multicollinearity between ethnicity and faith tradition.

We include controls for several types of resources that are correlated with secular and religious philanthropic behaviour (see for example Musick & Wilson 2008; Bekkers & Wiepking 2007; Smith et al. 2008, Finke et al. 2006, Iannaccone 1997, and Hoge 1994). Specifically, we control for education, labour force participation, verbal proficiency, salaries, and home ownership. Immigrants have lower levels of education (Hartgers 2008), they have lower levels of labor force participation (Van den Brakel, Moonen & Wageveld 2008), they have lower levels of verbal proficiency (Gijssberts & Schmeets 2008), they have lower salaries (Van den Brakel et al. 2008), and they are less likely to own their homes (Kullberg 2007). Moreover, the negative relation between level of resources and ethnicity is more profound for guest worker immigrants (Muslims) than for post colonial citizen immigrants (Hindus). Our analyses consist of four steps. In model 1, we show the differences between faith traditions. In our second model, we control for resources. In our third model, we add religious attendance and finally in our fourth model we include solicitation. We interpret remaining differences between faith traditions as evidence for differences in religious convictions.

## **RESULTS**

### ***Bivariate Analyses***

In table 1, we report differences between faith traditions in philanthropic behavior and explanatory variables.

[INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE]

We find that Protestants, people with an ‘other’ religion, and Roman Catholics are more like to report having been asked to donate at a religious service than Muslims, Hindus and the non-religious. In our sample, Roman Catholics and Protestants are more likely to report to have been asked to give outside a religious institution than people with an ‘other’ religion, the non-religious, Hindus and Muslims. Finally, we find that people with an ‘other’ religion are most likely to report to have been asked to volunteer, followed by Protestants, the non-religious, Roman Catholics, Hindus and Muslims.

We find that higher levels of religious attendance are positively related with the likelihood of religious giving among members of Christian religious groups ( $r(193) = .47$ ,  $p < .01$ ) and Muslims ( $r(411) = .17$ ,  $p < .01$ ), but not among Hindus. Also, we find that higher levels of religious attendance are not related with higher likelihood of secular giving among Hindus. However, we find that higher levels of religious attendance are *negatively* related ( $r(411) = -.12$ ,  $p < .05$ ) with the likelihood of secular giving among Muslims. Higher levels of religious attendance are not related with the amount donated to religious institutions and secular institution among Muslims and Hindus. We find a marginally significant positive relation between the levels of religious attendance and the amount donated to secular institutions ( $r(182) = .13$ ,  $p < .10$ ) among Christians. Finally, higher levels of religious attendance are positively related with likelihood of religious volunteering ( $r(193) = .24$ ,  $p < .01$ ) but not related with the likelihood of secular volunteering among Christians. We find similar results for Muslims: higher levels of religious attendance are positively related with the likelihood of religious volunteering ( $r(411) = .23$ ,  $p < .01$ ) but not related with the likelihood of secular volunteering. We find no relation between level of religious attendance and the likelihood of secular volunteering among Hindus. Taken together, these results show that the

relation between level of religious attendance and philanthropic behavior is strongest for Christians, followed by Muslims and Hindus. These results support our second hypothesis.

Among Christians having been asked to give during religious services is positively related with the likelihood of religious giving ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 195) = 14.76, p < .01$ , one-sided), but not with the likelihood of secular giving. However, being asked to give during services is not related with the amount donated to religious and secular institutions among Christian donors. Also, having been asked to give outside religious institutions is positively related with the likelihood of secular giving ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 195) = 8.09, p < .01$ , one-sided). Having been asked to give outside religious institutions is not related with the amount to secular organizations among Christian donors. Except for the amount donated among donors, these results support our third hypothesis.

Among Muslims having been asked to give during religious services is positively related with the likelihood of religious giving ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 412) = 22.74, p < .01$ , one-sided), but not with the likelihood of secular giving. Again, being asked to give during services is not related with the amount donated to religious institutions among Islamic donors. Having been asked to give outside religious institutions is positively related with the likelihood of secular giving ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 413) = 15.79, p < .01$ , one-sided) among Muslims. Having been asked to give outside religious institutions is not related with the amount to secular organizations among Islamic donors. Except for the level of giving among donors, these results support our third hypothesis.

Among Hindus having been asked to give during religious services is not related with the likelihood of religious and secular giving and the amount donated to religious institutions among Hindu donors. However, having been asked to give outside religious institutions is positively related with the likelihood of secular giving ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 60) = 2.94, p < .05$ , one-sided) among Hindus. Having been asked to give outside religious institutions is



not related with the amount to secular organizations among Hindu donors. These results do not support our second hypothesis regarding the likelihood of religious giving and level of religious and secular giving.

Finally, we find a relation between having been asked to volunteer and religious volunteering ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 195) = 5.31, p < .05$ , one-sided) and an even stronger relation between being asked to volunteer and secular volunteering ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 195) = 40.21, p < .01$ , one-sided) among members of Christian religious groups. We find similar results regarding Muslims, having been asked to volunteer and religious volunteering are positively related ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 412) = 16.06, p < .01$ , one-sided) and we also find a very strong relation between having been asked to volunteer and secular volunteering ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 414) = 74.32, p < .01$ , one-sided). Regarding having been asked to volunteer and secular volunteering among Hindus, we find a strong positive relation ( $\chi^2 (1, N = 62) = 19.74, p < .01$ , one-sided). These results support our third hypothesis. Finally, based on these results, we decided to include a fifth model in our multiple regression analyses. This model includes interactions between religious attendance and Protestant affiliation and between Hinduist affiliation and religious attendance. This enables us to formally test whether the relationship between religious attendance and philanthropic behavior varies significantly between faith traditions. The results will be discussed at the end of the reporting of the multivariate analyses.

### ***Explaining differences between faith traditions in giving***

We now present results of our multiple regression analyses of giving. Model 1 in table 2 shows that Protestants are more likely to give to religious institutions than Roman Catholics, Muslims, Hindus and people with another religion and the non-religious (note that odds ratios below 1 indicate negative relationships, and odds ratios above 1 indicate positive relationships). A comparison of the first two models of table 2 shows that differences

between Protestants and Muslims become weaker after controlling for resources. Additionally, the relationship between Protestants and the other faith tradition and also the non-religious is hardly affected by the inclusion of resources variables in the model.

[INSERT TABLE 2 ABOUT HERE]

Table 2 also shows that people with an ‘other’ income are slightly less likely to give to religious institutions. Model 3 shows that people with higher levels of religious attendance are more likely to give to religious institutions. Also, the difference between Roman Catholics and Protestants becomes weaker. It is also interesting to see that the relationship between gender and religious giving becomes significantly positive in this model. In Islam and Hinduism, women tend to have more private rituals of worshipping than men. Controlling for the level of religious attendance, women are more likely to donate to religious institutions. In the third model, people with an ‘other’ income’ and those who have better knowledge of the Dutch language are also more likely to give to religious institutions. The fourth model indicates that those who have been asked to give also are more likely to give to religious institutions. The relationships of religious giving with having an ‘other’ income and being female remain significant. Despite their positive relations with religious giving, differences in the level of religious attendance and having been asked to give do not explain all of the differences between faith traditions in the likelihood of religious giving. After all, Muslims, Roman Catholics and Protestants remain more likely to give to religious institutions than Hindus, people with an ‘other’ religion and the non-religious.

[INSERT TABLE 3 ABOUT HERE]

The results presented in table 3 only partly support our first hypothesis. Muslims are indeed less likely to engage in secular giving than Protestants and Roman Catholics. However, we did not find a significant difference between Hindus and Christians. A comparison of the results of the first two models shows that controlling for resources makes differences in the likelihood of secular giving between faith traditions disappear. In other words, differences in the likelihood of secular giving between faith traditions are explained by differences in the level of education, gender (being female) and knowledge of Dutch. Model 3 shows that religious attendance is not related to the likelihood of religious giving. Model 4 shows that having been asked to donate outside a religious institution is positively related with the likelihood of secular giving. The relationship between having been asked during religious services and secular giving is also positive, but fails to reach conventional levels of significance. This result indicates that differences in resources rather than religious teachings or attendance explains differences in the likelihood of secular giving between Christian and non-Christian religions in the Netherlands.

[INSERT TABLE 4 ABOUT HERE]

The analysis of the amount donated to religious institutions in table 4 shows that Protestants give higher amounts than Roman Catholics, Muslims and Hindus. After controlling for resources, Roman Catholics and Hindus still give significantly lower amounts to religious institutions. The difference between Protestants and Muslims disappear. Older people and home owners, and surprisingly students give higher amounts to religious institutions. People on welfare give lower amount to these type of institutions. After adding religious attendance the differences between Protestants, Catholics and Hindus become weaker. We find that a higher level of religious attendance is positively related with the amount donated to religious

institutions. After adding solicitation, we find that the negative relationship between religious giving and being Muslim reappears, indicating that the level of religious attendance and having been asked suppress the relationship with faith tradition. Surprisingly, having been asked to give outside a religious institution is also positively related with the amount donated to religious institutions.

[INSERT TABLE 5 ABOUT HERE]

The results in table 5 only partly support our first hypothesis. Muslims indeed give lower amounts to secular organizations. However, we did not find differences in the amount donated to secular organizations between Hindus and Christians. Controlling for resources in model 2 does not affect the lack of differences between faith traditions. However, model 2 shows that older people, people with higher incomes and the higher educated give higher amounts to secular organizations. In contrast, people on welfare give lower amounts to secular organizations. Model 3 shows that religious attendance is not related with the height of the amount donated to secular organizations. However, after controlling for religious attendance, Hindus give higher amounts to secular organizations. It is interesting to see that including religious attendance hardly affects the relation between level of resources and the amount donated to secular organizations. Model 4 shows that people who have been asked to give – both during religious services as well as outside religious institutions – give higher amounts to secular organizations. Also, almost all differences between faith traditions in amounts donated to secular organizations disappear. Only Muslims give less to secular organizations when solicitation variables are included.

### ***Explaining differences between faith traditions in volunteering***

The results in table 6 show that differences between faith traditions in the likelihood of religious can be explained by differences in level of resources, religious attendance and having been asked to volunteer: the differences between faith traditions diminish in model 3 and 4. Note that we excluded Hindus and the non-religious from the analyses, because none of these respondents in our sample reported volunteering for religious institutions.

[INSERT TABLE 6 ABOUT HERE]

In model 2, the negative relationship between religious volunteering and being Muslim disappears. This means that lower levels of religious volunteering by Muslims relative to Protestants can be explained by lower levels of resources among members of this religious group. Model 2 also shows that Roman Catholics have relatively low levels of religious volunteering given their level of resources. In model 3 all differences between faith traditions disappear. The religious volunteering rate among Protestants is not different any more from the rate among Catholics and Muslims. Respondents with higher levels of religious attendance are more likely to volunteer for religious institutions. This result suggest that Roman Catholics have relatively low levels of religious volunteering because of their lower levels of religious attendance . Finally, model 4 shows that respondents who were asked to volunteer are more likely to volunteer for religious institutions.

[INSERT TABLE 7 ABOUT HERE]

Finally, table 7 shows only small differences between faith traditions in the likelihood of secular volunteering. Roman Catholics report lower levels of secular volunteering than Protestants. This result does not support our first hypothesis. The lower level of secular

volunteering among Roman Catholics persists when including resources (model 2). Model 2 also shows that homemakers, people on welfare or benefit and people with higher levels of education are more likely to volunteer for secular organizations. Additionally, females are less likely to engage in secular volunteering. Model 3 shows that religious attendance does not affect the likelihood of secular volunteering. Model 4 shows a very strong relationship between having been asked to volunteer and volunteering for secular organizations. The relations between resources and the likelihood of secular volunteering become slightly weaker after adding having been asked to volunteer. Additionally, all differences between faith traditions disappear.

### ***How do relations with religious attendance differ between faith traditions?***

In hypothesis 2 we predicted that the relationship between religious attendance and giving and volunteering would differ systematically between faith traditions. Specifically, we expected that relationships between religious attendance and giving and volunteering would be stronger among Christians than among Muslims and Hindus. While our descriptive analysis supported this hypothesis, the multivariate regression analyses provide less strong support for this hypothesis. For reasons of space we omit the full tables of results here; they are available upon request.

When we limit our analyses to Christians, Hindus and Muslims, and include controls for resources and solicitation are included in regression models we find that indeed the relationship between attendance and giving and volunteering is more strongly positive among Christians than among Hindus and Muslims in four out of six regression analyses. In the analyses of the incidence as well as the amount of religious and secular giving we find that the interaction between religious attendance and Christian affiliation is positive. In the analyses of the incidence and amount of religious giving the coefficients are significant at the

$p < .05$  level and quite substantial (odds ratio of 1.67 and beta coefficient of .224). In the analyses of the incidence and level of secular giving the coefficients border the 10% significance level (odds ratio of 1.39 ( $p < .132$ ) and beta coefficient of .118 ( $p < .125$ ), respectively). In the analyses of religious and secular volunteering, in contrast, we find negative interactions between Christian affiliation and religious attendance (odds ratios of 0,74 ( $p < .529$ ) and 0,69 ( $p < .082$ ), respectively). These results indicate that religious attendance is less strongly related to both secular and religious volunteering among Christian immigrants than among Muslims and Hindus.

## CONCLUSION

In this paper, we investigated the philanthropic behaviour of Christians, Muslims and Hindus in the Netherlands. We explain differences in philanthropic behaviour between faith traditions by variation in level of resources, religious attendance and having been asked.

We expected that, based on differences in focus on who to help between religious teachings of Christians, Muslims and Hindus that Christians are more likely to engage in secular philanthropic behaviour than Muslims and Hindus. Our results support this hypothesis only for Muslims and not for Hindus and only for charitable giving and not for secular volunteering. Muslims are indeed less likely to engage in secular philanthropic behaviour and give lower amounts than members of Christian religious groups. We think that this result indicates that differences in religious teachings alone do not explain differences between faith traditions in secular philanthropic behaviour. Community aspects of religion do play a role. We are aware that we have to be careful with this conclusion, because the focus of the philanthropic behaviour of Hindus and Muslims could easily be

influenced by the fact that they are almost all (former) immigrants. Immigrants differ in their giving behaviour and volunteering behaviour from non-immigrants in the Netherlands (Carabain & Bekkers 2009; Carabain & Bekkers 2011). Additionally, Joseph (1995) showed that the giving behaviour of immigrants is likely to focus on the own ethnic and religious group, especially for immigrants that shortly reside in the country of destination. This could also be an alternative valid explanation of a focus on the own religious community in the philanthropic behaviour of Muslims. Almost all Muslims in the Netherlands are (former) guest worker immigrants from Turkey and Morocco or asylum seekers from Afghanistan. In contrast, the vast majority of Hindus in the Netherlands are (former) post colonial citizen immigrants, who are culturally and economically more similar to the native Dutch than guest worker immigrants (Carabain & Bekkers 2011). Therefore, the smaller differences between Hindus and Christians could also be due to immigrant status. With regard to the lack of differences in secular volunteering between especially Protestants and Hindus and Muslims, we expect that this may result from the fact that members of these faith traditions are younger and a considerable amount of their volunteering consists of volunteering for educational purposes. In the Netherlands, it is common for parents to volunteer in the school of their children.

Our second hypothesis focuses on the relation between religious attendance and philanthropic behaviour. Our results partially support our hypothesis based on differences in worship rituals. In religions in which worship rituals are more group-oriented the relation between religious attendance and philanthropic behaviour is stronger than in religions in which worship rituals are more private. Islam and especially Hinduism, tend to have more private practices of worship. Religious and secular giving in these faith traditions is less strongly related to religious attendance. Levels of volunteering, in contrast, seem to be more strongly related to religious attendance among Muslims and Hindus than among Christians.



We suspect that the strong relation between religious attendance and philanthropic behaviour that emerges from the literature thus far is partly the result of a strong focus on Christian faith traditions.

We find partial support for our third hypothesis. Having been asked to engage in philanthropic behaviour is indeed strongly related to the likelihood of giving and volunteering, also among Muslims and Hindus. Notably, we did not find a relation between having been asked and the level of giving among donors. More interestingly, we did not find a relation between having been asked during religious services and the likelihood of religious giving. We explain this difference by the more private character of the worship rituals of Hindus and Islamic women.

An important finding in this study is that philanthropic behaviour between Muslims and Hindus in the Netherlands differs quite substantially. Muslims are more strongly engaged in religious giving and less so in secular philanthropy than Hindus. At the same time, Muslims report more volunteering – both religious as well as secular – than Hindus. These differences cannot easily be explained by differences in ‘community’ aspects of religion.

## **DISCUSSION**

Despite providing new insights into differences in charitable giving and volunteering between faith traditions by including Islam and Hinduism in our analyses, we were unable to explain the differences between faith traditions completely. Controlling for resources, religious attendance and having been asked left us with substantial differences between faith traditions. A comparison of the results presented in this paper with the results of Bekkers & Schuyt (2008) on denominational differences among native Dutch Christians yields

interesting differences. While among native Dutch Christians the community explanation received stronger support for religious giving than for secular giving, this does not hold among immigrants and with the inclusion of non-Christian religions. In fact, the community explanation is supported only for religious volunteering. Muslims are less likely to donate money to secular causes than members of other religious groups mainly because of their lower level of resources. Conversely, despite their lower levels of resources, Muslims are much more likely to engage in religious giving and give higher amounts than members of other groups. This also holds for secular volunteering. These differences persist when community aspects of religion such as the frequency of religious attendance and solicitation are controlled. We have assumed that these differences are due to differences in ‘convictions’ or religious teachings. However, the differences may also result from differences in immigration history and social barriers between Muslims, Hindus and Dutch society. Remember that the Muslim and Hindu respondents in this study are almost all immigrants. The immigration histories of both groups and the current level of integration in Dutch society may confound the differences between the religious groups. Future research should include measures of social barriers or inclusion in Dutch society to explain differences in philanthropic behaviour completely. It should be noted, however, that such barriers are at odds with the relatively high level of secular volunteering among Muslims.

Finally, our results suggest that Durkheim’s theory may only be valid in a Christian context. One of the assumptions of his theory is that (Christian) religious teachings hardly differ and therefore differences between religious denominations are better explained by the social cohesion of such communities. We argue that social cohesion in religious communities may be influenced by the worship rituals of that particular faith tradition. Our results indicate that if religions have more private practices of worshipping, for example in the cases of Islamic women and Hindus in general, relations between religious attendance and charitable

giving become weaker. The results for volunteering, however, show a contrasting pattern. At present it is not clear what causes these differences. What is clear, however, is that the relationship between religious attendance and giving and volunteering differs between faith traditions. Further research is clearly needed to test whether the current findings generalize to other countries and other immigrant groups.

### **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

NCDO (National Committee for International Cooperation and Sustainable Development, The Netherlands) and Greenpeace Netherlands funded the data collection of the immigrant study of the Giving in the Netherlands Panel Survey 2007. We thank Evelien Boonstoppel for excellent research assistance.

## REFERENCES

- Alterman, J.B. & S. Hunter (2004). *The Idea of Philanthropy in Muslim Context*. Washington: CSIS.
- Alwin, D.F. (1991). Family of Origin and Cohort Differences in Verbal Ability. *American Sociological Review*, 56, 625-38.
- Anand, P. (2003). *Hindu Diaspora and Religious Philanthropy in the United States*. Paper presented at the 6<sup>th</sup> International Society for Third Sector Research, Toronto, Canada.
- Arts (2009). Ontwikkeling in Kerkelijkheid en Kerkbezoek 1999-2008. In *Religie aan het Begin van de 21<sup>e</sup> Eeuw*. Den Haag/Heerlen: CBS.
- Becker, J. & De Hart, J. (2006). *Godsdienstige Veranderingen in Nederland*. The Hague: SCP.
- Bekkers, R. (2006). Traditional and Health-Related Philanthropy: The role of resources and Personality. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 4, 349-66.
- Bekkers, R. & Schuyt, T.N.M. (2008). And who is your neighbour? Explaining denominational differences in charitable giving and volunteering in the Netherlands. *Review of Religious Research*, 50(1), 74-96.

Bekkers, R. & Wiepking, P. (2007). Generosity and Philanthropy: A Literature Review (October 28, 2007). Available at SSRN: <http://ssrn.com/abstract=1015507>.

Berger, I. (2006). The Influence of Religion on Philanthropy in Canada. *Voluntas*, 17(2), 114-132.

Bowen, K. (1999). *Religion, Participation, and Charitable Giving: A Report*. Toronto: Volunteer Canada & the Canadian Center for Philanthropy.

Brady, H.E., Verba, S. & K.L. Scholzman (1999). Prospecting for Participants: Rational Expectations and the Recruitment of Political Activists. *American Political Science Review* 93:153-69.

Carabain, C.L. & R. Bekkers (2009). Charitable giving by Immigrants in the Netherlands. Paper presented at the Giving and Volunteering Research Conference 2009, VU University, Amsterdam.

Carabain, C.L. & R. Bekkers (2011). Religious and Secular Volunteering: a Comparison between Immigrants and Non-immigrants in the Netherlands. *Voluntary Sector Review*, 2(1), 23-41.

CBS (2005). Enquêteonderzoek onder allochtonen. Problemen en Oplossingen. Voorburg / Heerlen: CBS.

Chaves, M. (2002). Financing American Religion. *New Directions in Philanthropic Fundraising*, 35, 41-54.

Cnaan, R.A., Katerndahl, A. & Wineburg, R.J. (1993). Religious People, Religious COngregations, and Volunteerism in Human Services: Is there a Link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 22, 33-54.

Durkheim, R. (1897). *La Suicide: Etude de Sociologie*. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Finke, R. Bahr, M. & C.P. Scheitle (2006). *Toward Explaining Congregational Giving*, *Social Science Research*, 35(3), 620-641.

Gesthuizen, M. & G. Kraaykamp (2002). Verbal ability of low-educated people in the Netherlands: the downside of educational expansion. *The Netherlands' Journal of Social Sciences*, 38, 191-211

Giving in the Netherlands Immigrant Survey (GINIS): 2006-2008. [machine-readable data file]. Carabain, Christine L.; Bekkers, René. [principle investigator(s)]. Amsterdam: VU University, Philanthropic Studies [distributor].

Gijsberts, M & H. Schmeets (2008). Sociaal-Culturele oriëntatie en maatschappelijke participatie. In *Jaarrapport Integratie 2008* Oudhof, K., van der Vliet, R. & B. Hermans (eds.); Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

Hartgers, M (2008). Onderwijs. In *Jaarrapport Integratie 2008* Oudhof, K., van der Vliet, R. & B. Hermans (eds); Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

Hoge, D.R. (1994). Introduction: The Problem of Understanding Church Giving. *Review of Religious Research*, 36, 101-110.

Iannaccone, L.R. (1997). Skewness Explained: a Rational Choice Model of Religious Giving. *Journal of the Scientific study of Religion*, 36 (2), 141-157.

Joseph, J.A. (1995). *Remaking America: How Benevolent Traditions of Many Cultures Are Transforming Our National Life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kullberg, J. (2007). Fysieke en Sociale kwaliteit van wonen in en buiten concentratiewijken. In *Jaarrapport Integratie 2007* Dagevos, J. & M. Gijsberts (eds.); Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

Musick, M.A. & J. Wilson (2008). *Volunteers: A Social Profile*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Osili, U.O. & Du, D. (2005). Immigrant assimilation and charitable giving. *New directions for Philanthropic Fundraising*, 48, 89-104.

Presser, S. & Stinson, M. (1998). Data Collection Mode and Social Desirability Bias in Self-Reported Religious Attendance. *American Sociological Review*, 63, 137-45.

Rooney, P., Steinberg, K. & P. Schervish (2001). A Methodological Comparison of Giving Surveys: Indiana As a Test Case. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 30, 551-568.

Senturk, O.F. (2007). *Charity in Islam: A comprehensive guide to zakat*. Somerset, NJ: The Light, Inc.

Schmeets, H. & S. te Riele (2009). Religie in het perspectief van sociale samenhang. In *Religie aan het Begin van de 21<sup>e</sup> Eeuw*. Den Haag/Heerlen: CBS.

Smith, C., Emerson, M.O. & P. Snell (2008). *Passing the Plate. Why American Christians Don't Give Away More Money*. Oxford; New York : Oxford University Press

Van den Brakel. M, Moonen, L. & M. Wageveld (2008). Inkomen en Uitkeringen. In *Jaarrapport Integratie 2008* Oudhof, K., van der Vliet, R. & B. Hermans (eds); Den Haag: Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek.

Van der Bie (2009). Kerkelijkheid en Kerkelijke Diversiteit 1889-2008. In *Religie aan het Begin van de 21<sup>e</sup> Eeuw*. Den Haag/Heerlen: CBS.

Van Herten, M. (2009). Het aantal Islamieten in Nederland. In *Religie aan het Begin van de 21<sup>e</sup> Eeuw*. Den Haag/Heerlen: CBS.

Van Tubergen, F., Te Grotenhuis, M. & W. Ultee (2005). Denomination, Religious Context, and Suicide: Neo-Durkheim Multilevel Explanations Tested with Individual and Contextual Data. *American Journal of Sociology*, 111, 797-823.



Vermeulen, H. & R. Pennix (2000). *Immigrant Integration: The Dutch Case*. Amsterdam: Het Spinhuis.

Winship, C. & L. Radbill (1994). Sampling Weights and Regression Analysis. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 23 (2), 230-57.

Wuthnow, R. (1991). *Acts of Compassion: Caring for Others and Helping Ourselves*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Table 1. Volunteering and Giving, Variables by faith tradition

	<i>Protestants (n=58)</i>	<i>Roman Catholics (n=136)</i>	<i>Muslims (n=413)</i>	<i>Hindus (n=61)</i>	<i>Other religion (n=38)</i>	<i>No religion (n=200)</i>
Incidence of religious giving	.58	.35	.61	.13	.29	.05
Incidence of secular giving	.81	.85	.65	.83	.90	.75
Donations to Church among donors	230	93	272	53	555	149
Donations to other organizations among donors	328	217	140	177	175	167
Incidence of religious volunteering	.14	.03	.06	-	.13	-
Incidence of secular volunteering	.33	.20	.30	.26	.37	.34
Having been asked to give during religious services	.24	.12	.05	.03	.21	.02
Having been asked to give outside a religious institutions	.44	.52	.32	.33	.34	.33
Having been asked to volunteer	.48	.40	.34	.36	.55	.44
No religious attendance	.24	.32	.30	.56	.34	1.00
Religious attendance: few times a year	.27	.62	.35	.30	.18	-
Religious attendance: once a week or more	.50	.06	.35	.13	.47	-
Turkish decent	-	-	.36	-	.03	.05
Moroccan descent	-	-	.36	-	.05	.05
Surinamese descent	.19	.16	.03	.90	.40	.20
Antillean descent	.41	.65	-	.10	.32	.12
Afghan descent	.02	.18	.24	-	.08	.03
Dutch natives	.38	-	-	-	.13	.56
Average age	43	40	36	42	38	39
Female	.60	.53	.47	.46	.69	.44
Paid work	.32	.48	.43	.38	.50	.48
Homemaker	.09	.09	.12	.12	.03	.14
Welfare/Benefit	.10	.16	.19	.21	.13	.13
Old age pension	.22	.07	.05	.08	.05	.10
Study scholarship	.19	.14	.18	.13	.16	.10
Income, other	.07	.07	.04	.08	.11	.07
Home owner	.19	.23	.17	.25	.29	.30
Average personal net income (in euro)	9.552	11.089	8.885	8.718	9.847	12.495
Lower education	.41	.34	.51	.56	.40	.37
Intermediate education	.46	.50	.35	.33	.40	.38
Higher Education	.15	.15	.14	.13	.21	.25
Knowledge of Dutch	.73	.69	.37	.65	.64	.77

Table 2. *Logit regression analyses of incidence of religious giving (n=906)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)	
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---	
Roman Catholic	.40	**	.41	**	.59		.60	
Islam	.57	*	.69		.77		.98	
Hinduism	.12	**	.13	**	.17	**	.21	**
Other religion	.31	**	.33	*	.26	**	.22	**
No Religion	.04	**	.04	**	.08	**	.09	**
Religious attendance					1.53	**	1.41	**
Having been asked to give during religious services							7.98	**
Having been asked to give outside religious institutions							1.32	
Female			1.29		1.75	**	1.66	**
Age			1.01		1.01		1.00	
Income status (ref. paid work)			---		---		---	
Homemaker			1.24		1.19		1.18	
Welfare/benefit			.94		.89		.94	
Old age pension			.87		.78		1.05	
Study scholarship			.90		.77		.79	
Income, other			.44	†	.41	*	.35	*
Home owner			.92		.98		.95	
Yearly income			1.00		1.00		1.00	
Education (ref.: lower)			---		---		---	
Intermediate education			1.07		1.07		1.08	
Higher education			.96		1.05		1.00	
Knowledge of Dutch			1.49		1.60	†	1.42	
Constant	1.34	*	.66		.29	**	.27	**
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.15		.23		.28		.33	

\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, † p < .1.

Table 3. *Logit regression analyses of incidence of secular giving (n=906)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4
	Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---
Roman Catholic	1.32		1.47		1.44		1.43
Islam	.42	*	.74		.73		.79
Hinduism	1.10		1.39		1.35		1.55
Other religion	1.87		2.03		2.03		2.31
No Religion	.66		.62		.59		.68
Religious attendance					.98		.96
Having been asked to give during religious services							1.91
Having been asked to give outside religious institutions							2.19 **
Female			1.86 **		1.83 **		1.82 **
Age			1.01		1.01		1.01
Income status (ref. paid work)			---		---		---
Homemaker			.99		.99		.93
Welfare/benefit			.99		.99		.97
Old age pension			.90		.91		.92
Study scholarship			.76		.76		.74
Income, other			.78		.78		.65
Home owner			1.20		1.20		1.13
Yearly income			1.00		1.00		1.00
Education (ref.: lower)			---		---		---
Intermediate education			1.10		1.10		1.11
Higher education			2.38 **		2.37 **		2.34 **
Knowledge of Dutch			3.89 **		3.89 **		3.31 **
Constant	4.44 **		.77		.80		.64
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.06		.17		.17		.20

\*\* p &lt; .01, \* p &lt; .05, † p &lt; .1.

Table 4. *OLS regression analyses of amount donated to religious institutions among donors (n=288)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	B		B		B		B	
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---	
Roman Catholic	-1.28	**	-1.29	**	-1.11	**	-1.15	**
Islam	-.56	*	-.42		-.28		-.20	
Hinduism	-1.05	*	-1.24	*	-.84	†	-.78	
Other religion	.65		.61		-.47		.45	
No Religion	-.35		-.41		.15		.12	
Religious attendance					.21	**	.18	**
Having been asked to give during religious services							.32	
Having been asked to give outside religious institutions							.35	*
Female			.10		.30	†	.23	
Age			.02	*	.02	*	.02	*
Income status (ref. paid work)			---		---		---	
Homemaker			-.22		-.30		-.35	
Welfare/benefit			-.33	*	-.33		-.35	
Old age pension			-.33		-.29		-.22	
Study scholarship			.12	*	.08		.03	
Income, other			.45		.40		.35	
Home owner			.34	†	.21		.29	
Yearly income			.00		.00		.00	
Education (ref.: lower)			---		---		---	
Intermediate education			.14		.13		.17	
Higher education			.18		.23		.21	
Knowledge of Dutch			-.05		.03		-.08	
Constant	4.90	**	3.88	**	3.30	**	3.24	**
Adjusted R <sup>2</sup>	.09		.11		.14		.17	

\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, † p < .1.

Table 5. *OLS regression analyses of amount donated to secular organizations among donors (n=661)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	B		B		B		B	
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---	
Roman Catholic	-.14		-.19		-.11		-.08	
Islam	-.68	**	-.54	*	-.50	*	-.41	†
Hinduism	-.08		-.06		.03	†	.13	
Other religion	-.31		-.31		-.30		-.23	
No Religion	-.53	*	-.69	**	-.54	*	-.44	
Religious attendance					.07		.04	
Having been asked to give during religious services							.40	*
Having been asked to give outside religious institutions							.27	*
Female			-.03		.00		-.02	
Age			.01	*	.01	*	.01	*
Income status (ref. paid work)			---		---		---	
Homemaker			-.20		.19		.17	
Welfare/benefit			-.38	*	-.39	*	-.38	
Old age pension			-.27		-.28		-.24	
Study scholarship			-.35		-.37	*	-.36	
Income, other			-.29		-.29		-.33	
Home owner			.21		.21		.20	
Yearly income			.00	*	.00	*	.00	*
Education (ref.: lower)			---		---		---	
Intermediate education			.25	*	.25	*	.26	*
Higher education			.51	**	.52	**	.52	**
Knowledge of Dutch			.14		.15		.07	
Constant	4.80	**	3.88		3.79	**	3.71	**
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.03		.11		.11		.12	

\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, † p < .1.

Table 6. *Logit regression analyses of incidence of religious volunteering (n=653)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)	
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---	
Roman Catholic	.20	*	.19	*	.55		.60	
Islam	.36	†	.56		.78		.64	
Other religion	.95		1.23		.63		.43	
Religious attendance					3.26	**	3.50	**
Having been asked to volunteer							7.28	**
Female			.77		1.24		1.00	
Age			1.07	**	1.07	**	1.08	**
Income status (ref. paid work)			---		---		---	
Homemaker			2.29		2.77		1.93	
Welfare/benefit			1.25		1.32		1.08	
Old age pension			.23	†	.14	*	.14	*
Study scholarship			3.99	*	5.10	*	5.92	*
Income, other			.51		.65		.75	
Home owner			1.04		1.79		1.76	
Yearly income			1.00		1.00		1.00	
Education (ref.: lower)			---		---		---	
Intermediate education			1.51		1.46		1.20	
Higher education			.69		.79		.52	
Knowledge of Dutch			1.86		3.16	†	1.89	
Constant	.15	**	.05	**	.00	**	.00	**
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.04		.12		.33		.42	

\*\* p < .01, \* p < .05, † p < .1.

Table 7. *Logit regression analyses of incidence of secular volunteering (n=906)*

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)		Exp (B)	
Affiliation (ref.: Protestant)	---		---		---		---	
Roman Catholic	.50	†	.50	†	.54	†	.54	
Islam	.87		1.04		1.07		1.26	
Hinduism	.69		.71		.77		.90	
Other	1.23		1.48		1.47		1.22	
No Religion	1.03		.96		1.13		1.19	
Religious attendance					1.09		1.09	
Having been asked to volunteer							8.22	**
Female			.71	*	.74	†	.64	*
Age			1.01		1.01		1.00	
Income status (ref. paid work)	---		---		---		---	
Homemaker			3.07	**	3.06	**	3.43	**
Welfare/benefit			1.55	†	1.54	†	1.56	†
Old age pension			1.13		1.12		1.30	
Study scholarship			1.36		1.33		1.24	
Income, other			1.05		1.06		1.00	
Home owner			.85		.85		.85	
Yearly income			1.00		1.00		1.00	
Education (ref.: lower)	---		---		---		---	
Intermediate education			1.54	*	1.55	*	1.38	
Higher education			2.57	**	2.61	**	2.80	**
Knowledge of Dutch			1.48		1.49		1.10	
Constant	.50	*	.16	**	.14	**	.08	**
Nagelkerke R <sup>2</sup>	.02		.08		.09		.31	

\*\* p &lt; .01, \* p &lt; .05, † p &lt; .1.